



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,328	05/15/2001	Robert Vogel	18360/215625	3579

826 7590 12/20/2004

ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA  
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/858,328	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VOGEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey D. Popham	<b>Art Unit</b> 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20010904</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

***Remarks***

1. Claims 1-32 are pending.

***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - Page 9, line 9: "numeral indicate" should be "numerals indicate".

Appropriate correction is required.

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claims are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 (a) because of the following informalities:

- Line 14 of claim 31 recites the limitation "said physical address". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
- In line 3 of claim 1, "in interest in" should be "an interest in".

- In the final line of claims 12, 21, 31, and 32, "from Second Party" should be "from said Second Party".
- The final paragraph of claim 21 is improperly formatted.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106).

Regarding Claim 1,

Rozen et al. disclose the following:

A method of authorizing the transfer of various types of information within a group of parties, including a first party [requester], a second party [service provider], and a third party [participant], the first party holding first party information, and the third party having an interest in third party information held by the second party, the method including the following steps:

Facilitating a request from the first party to the second party to allow the first party to access third party information held by the second party (Column 7, lines 40-48);

Facilitating authorization of the first party's request by the third party by the transfer of the authorization code from the third party to the first party (Column 7, lines 57-61); and

Facilitation of the presentation of the authorization code from the first party to the second party, such that the first party is authorized to obtain the third party information from the second party (Column 7, lines 48-53).

Rozen et al. do not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party.

This system does not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request with authorization from the second party to the third party.

In another embodiment within Rozen et al., however, the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party accompanied by authorization information is disclosed (Column 8, lines 33-44 and 54-59). In this embodiment, the third party is a service representative acting on behalf of the participant (patient at the emergency medical facility) when the participant is too disabled to provide the emergency medical facility with information. This new system would be

the system from above including a representative that acts on behalf of the participant acting as the third party for authorization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the forwarding of the request and authorization information, as disclosed in the second embodiment, in the first embodiment of Rozen et al. in order to allow only an authorized emergency medical facility with the participant's emergency information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to verify that the emergency medical facility is who they say they are and should be allowed to obtain access to the incapacitated patient's medical records (Column 8, lines 47-53).

Regarding Claim 3,

Rozen et al. disclose that the first party's access to third party information can later be withdrawn (Column 7, lines 62-67).

Regarding Claim 4,

Rozen et al. disclose that the second party can report to the third party who has access to the third party information and information about their access status (Column 9, lines 59-65).

Regarding Claim 7,

Rozen et al. disclose that the third party information relates to medical records (Column 7, lines 40-48).

Regarding Claim 9,

Rozen et al. disclose that the third party is a person and the third party information relates to information personal to the third party (Column 5, lines 21-26).

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Keene (U.S. Patent 5,325,294).

Rozen et al. do not disclose that the first party can designate a related internal party to receive the authorization code from the third party.

Keene, however, discloses that a first party attempting to access the medical information about a person can hand the phone to a related internal party to receive the authorization code and subsequently access the medical information (Column 3, lines 7-23). This new system would be the system from above allowing the first party to designate a related party to receive the authorization code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to allow the first party to designate another party to receive the authorization code in order to let another related person gain access to the information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow access to someone that has a need or a right to know the information (Column 1, lines 13-20).

Art Unit: 2137

8. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Knowles et al. (U.S. Patent 5,869,819).

Regarding Claim 5,

Rozen et al. do not disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery.

Knowles et al., however, disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery (Column 19, lines 30-65). This new system would be the system from above wherein the third party information includes parcel delivery information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have parcel delivery information included in the third party information in order to allow this system to be used in the field of parcel delivery. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow authorization of package tracking from different types of computer systems (Column 19, line 66 to Column 20, line 10).

Regarding Claim 6,

Rozen et al. do not disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery, nor that it includes a delivery name and address or reference number.

Knowles et al., however disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery, and includes a delivery name and address as



Art Unit: 2137

well as a reference number (Column 19, lines 30-65, with particular reference to lines 31-44). This new system would be the system from above wherein the third party information includes parcel delivery information, itself including a delivery name and address as well as reference number.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have parcel delivery information included in the third party information in order to allow this system to be used in the field of parcel delivery. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow authorization of package tracking from different types of computer systems (Column 19, line 66 to Column 20, line 10).

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Stock et al. (U.S. Patent 6,011,858).

Rozen et al. do not disclose that the third party information relates to credit information.

Stock et al., however, disclose that the third party information relates to credit information (Column 4, lines 33-43). This new system would be the system from above with third party information could relate to credit information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to allow the third party information to relate to credit

Art Unit: 2137

information because credit information is personal, just like medical records.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict access to such personal information to only authorized persons.

10. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Uchikubo (U.S. Patent 6,602,185).

Regarding Claim 11,

Rozen et al. do not disclose that the first party and third party are different entities within an overall commonly-controlled company.

Uchikubo, however, discloses that the first and third parties are different entities within an overall commonly-controlled organization (Column 22, lines 27-35 and Column 26, lines 16-24). This new system would be the system from above allowing the first and third parties to be within the same organization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have both the first and third parties be part of the same organization in order to allow for a more diverse setup. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to make use of any types of communication lines from small local area networks and public lines (large network).

Regarding Claim 10,

Claim 10 is a broader representation of narrower claim 11 and, as such, is rejected under a similar rationale.

11. Claims 12, 16, 18, 21, 26, 28, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Austin (U.S. Patent 6,157,924).

Regarding Claim 12,

Rozen et al. disclose the following:

A method of authorizing the transfer of various types of information within a group of parties, including a first party [requester], a second party [service provider], and a third party [participant], the first party holding first party information, and the third party having an interest in third party information held by the second party, the method including the following steps:

Facilitating a request from the first party to the second party to allow the first party to access third party information held by the second party (Column 7, lines 40-48);

Facilitating authorization of the first party's request by the third party by the transfer of the authorization code from the third party to the first party (Column 7, lines 57-61); and

Facilitation of the presentation of the authorization code from the first party to the second party, such that the first party is authorized to

obtain the third party information from the second party (Column 7, lines 48-53).

Rozen et al. do not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party.

This system does not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request with authorization from the second party to the third party.

In another embodiment within Rozen et al., however, the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party accompanied by authorization information is disclosed (Column 8, lines 33-44 and 54-59). In this embodiment, the third party is a service representative acting on behalf of the participant (patient at the emergency medical facility) when the participant is too disabled to provide the emergency medical facility with information. This new system would be the system from above including a representative that acts on behalf of the participant acting as the third party for authorization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the forwarding of the request and authorization information, as disclosed in the second embodiment, in the first embodiment of Rozen et al. in order to allow only an authorized emergency medical facility with the participant's emergency information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to verify that the emergency medical facility is who they say they are and

should be allowed to obtain access to the incapacitated patient's medical records (Column 8, lines 47-53).

Neither of the embodiments of Rozen et al. disclose the hand delivery of the authorization code to the third party.

Austin, however, discloses the hand delivery of mail from the mail courier to the user (Column 13, lines 39-43). This new system would be the system from above using a postal courier to deliver the authorization code to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the authorization code to be sent via mail because some people feel that physical mail is more secure than electronic communications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to give the user a higher sense of security in the distribution of the mail (Column 1, line 64 to Column 2, line 6).

Regarding Claim 16,

Rozen et al. disclose that the third party information relates to medical records (Column 7, lines 40-48).

Regarding Claim 18,

Rozen et al. disclose that the third party is a person and the third party information relates to information personal to the third party (Column 5, lines 21-26).

Regarding Claim 21,

Rozen et al. disclose the following:

A method of authorizing the transfer of various types of information within a group of parties, including a first party [requester], a second party [service provider], and a third party [participant], the first party holding first party information, and the third party having an interest in third party information held by the second party, the method including the following steps:

Facilitating a request from the first party to the second party to allow the first party to access third party information held by the second party (Column 7, lines 40-48);

Facilitating authorization of the first party's request by the third party by the transfer of the authorization code from the third party to the first party (Column 7, lines 57-61); and

Facilitation of the presentation of the authorization code from the first party to the second party, such that the first party is authorized to obtain the third party information from the second party (Column 7, lines 48-53).

Rozen et al. do not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party.

This system does not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request with authorization from the second party to the third party.

In another embodiment within Rozen et al., however, the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party accompanied by authorization information is disclosed (Column 8, lines 33-44 and 54-59). In this embodiment, the third party is a service representative acting on behalf of the participant (patient at the emergency medical facility) when the participant is too disabled to provide the emergency medical facility with information. This new system would be the system from above including a representative that acts on behalf of the participant acting as the third party for authorization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the forwarding of the request and authorization information, as disclosed in the second embodiment, in the first embodiment of Rozen et al. in order to allow only an authorized emergency medical facility with the participant's emergency information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to verify that the emergency medical facility is who they say they are and should be allowed to obtain access to the incapacitated patient's medical records (Column 8, lines 47-53).

Neither of the embodiments of Rozen et al. disclose the identification of a physical address of the third party or hand delivery of the authorization code to the third party.

Austin, however, discloses the identification of a physical address associated with the user. Austin also discloses the hand delivery of mail from the mail courier to the user (Column 13, lines 39-43). This new system would be the system from above using a postal courier to deliver the authorization code to the user at a certain physical address.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the authorization code to be sent via mail because some people feel that physical mail is more secure than electronic communications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to give the user a higher sense of security in the distribution of the mail (Column 1, line 64 to Column 2, line 6).

Regarding Claim 26,

Rozen et al. disclose that the third party information relates to medical records (Column 7, lines 40-48).

Regarding Claim 28,

Rozen et al. disclose that the third party is a person and the third party information relates to information personal to the third party (Column 5, lines 21-26).

Regarding Claim 32,

Rozen et al. disclose the following:

A method of authorizing the transfer of various types of information within a group of parties, including a first party [requester], a second party



Art Unit: 2137

[service provider], and a third party [participant], the first party holding first party information, and the third party having an interest in third party information held by the second party, the method including the following steps:

Facilitating a request from the first party to the second party to allow the first party to access third party information held by the second party (Column 7, lines 40-48);

Facilitating authorization of the first party's request by the third party by the transfer of the authorization code from the third party to the first party (Column 7, lines 57-61); and

Facilitation of the presentation of the authorization code from the first party to the second party, such that the first party is authorized to obtain the third party information from the second party (Column 7, lines 48-53).

Rozen et al. do not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party.

This system does not disclose the forwarding of the first party's request with authorization from the second party to the third party.

In another embodiment within Rozen et al., however, the transmission of first party information along with the request is disclosed (Column 8, lines 33-41).

This second embodiment also discloses the forwarding of the first party's request from the second party to the third party accompanied by authorization information and the first party information (Column 8, lines 33-44 and 54-59). In this embodiment, the third party is a service representative acting on behalf of the participant (patient at the emergency medical facility) when the participant is too disabled to provide the emergency medical facility with information.

This new system would be the system from above including a representative that acts on behalf of the participant acting as the third party for authorization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the forwarding of the request and authorization information, as disclosed in the second embodiment, in the first embodiment of Rozen et al. in order to allow only an authorized emergency medical facility with the participant's emergency information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to verify that the emergency medical facility is who they say they are and should be allowed to obtain access to the incapacitated patient's medical records (Column 8, lines 47-53).

Neither of the embodiments of Rozen et al. disclose the identification of a physical address of the third party or hand delivery of the authorization code to the third party.

Austin, however, discloses the identification of a physical address associated with the user. Austin also discloses the hand delivery of mail from the mail courier to the user (Column 13, lines 39-43). This new system would be the system from above using a postal courier to deliver the authorization code to the user at a certain physical address.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the authorization code to be sent via mail because some people feel that physical mail is more secure than electronic communications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to give the user a higher sense of security in the distribution of the mail (Column 1, line 64 to Column 2, line 6).

Regarding Claim 31,

Claim 31 is a broader representation of claim 32 and would be identical to it if there was sufficient antecedent basis for that which was discussed above and, therefore, is rejected under a similar rationale.

12. Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Austin (U.S. Patent 6,157,924) further in view of Keene (U.S. Patent 5,325,294).

Regarding Claim 13,

The system from above does not disclose that the first party can designate a related internal party to receive the authorization code from the third party.

Keene, however, discloses that a first party attempting to access the medical information about a person can hand the phone to a related internal party to receive the authorization code and subsequently access the medical information (Column 3, lines 7-23). This new system would be the system from above allowing the first party to designate a related party to receive the authorization code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to allow the first party to designate another party to receive the authorization code in order to let another related person gain access to the information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow access to someone that has a need or a right to know the information (Column 1, lines 13-20).

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 augments claim 21 in the same way that claim 13 augments claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected under a similar rationale.

13. Claims 14, 15, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Austin (U.S. Patent 6,157,924) further in view of Knowles et al. (U.S. Patent 5,869,819).

Regarding Claim 14,

The system from above does not disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery.

Knowles et al., however, disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery (Column 19, lines 30-65). This new system would be the system from above wherein the third party information includes parcel delivery information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have parcel delivery information included in the third party information in order to allow this system to be used in the field of parcel delivery. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow authorization of package tracking from different types of computer systems (Column 19, line 66 to Column 20, line 10).

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 augments claim 21 in the same way that claim 14 augments claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 15,

The system from above does not disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery, nor that it includes a delivery name and address or reference number.

Knowles et al., however disclose that the third party information relates to parcel delivery, and includes a delivery name and address as well as a reference number (Column 19, lines 30-65, with particular reference to lines 31-44). This new system would be the system from above wherein the third party information includes parcel delivery information, itself including a delivery name and address as well as reference number.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have parcel delivery information included in the third party information in order to allow this system to be used in the field of parcel delivery. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow authorization of package tracking from different types of computer systems (Column 19, line 66 to Column 20, line 10).

Regarding Claim 25,

Claim 25 augments claim 21 in the same way that claim 15 augments claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected under a similar rationale.

14. Claims 17 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Austin (U.S. Patent 6,157,924) further in view of Stock et al. (U.S. Patent 6,011,858).

Regarding Claim 17,

The system from above does not disclose that the third party information relates to credit information.

Stock et al., however, disclose that the third party information relates to credit information (Column 4, lines 33-43). This new system would be the system from above with third party information could relate to credit information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to allow the third party information to relate to credit information because credit information is personal, just like medical records. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict access to such personal information to only authorized persons.

Regarding Claim 27,

Claim 27 augments claim 21 in the same way that claim 17 augments claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected under a similar rationale.

15. Claims 19, 20, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Austin (U.S. Patent 6,157,924) further in view of Uchikubo (U.S. Patent 6,602,185).

Regarding Claim 19,

The system from above does not disclose that the first party and third party are different entities within an overall commonly-controlled company.

Uchikubo, however, discloses that the first and third parties are different entities within an overall commonly-controlled organization (Column 22, lines 27-35 and Column 26, lines 16-24). This new system would be the system from above allowing the first and third parties to be within the same organization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have both the first and third parties be part of the same organization in order to allow for a more diverse setup. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to make use of any types of communication lines from small local area networks and public lines (large network).

Regarding Claim 29,

Claim 29 augments claim 21 in the same way that claim 19 augments claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is a broader representation of narrower claim 19 and, as such, is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 30,



Claim 30 augments claim 21 in the same way that claim 20  
augments claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected under a similar rationale.

16. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,073,106) in view of Austin (U.S. Patent 6,157,924) further in view of Connell et al. (U.S. Patent 5,554,842).

The system from above does not disclose that the hand delivery of the authorization code is done via first class mail.

Connell et al., however, disclose that the USPS (United States Postal Service) delivers first class mail (Column 1, lines 24-29). This new system would be the system from above using first class mail as the method of hand delivery.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use first class mail because it is well known. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use first class mail because it is classified as "normal mail" sent through the USPS and can be handled faster than special types of mail.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Caldwell  
Andrew Caldwell